



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

zius, not Manzius. The following comments bear on the notes to the *Femmes Savantes*:

Page 63, line 179. *et faites une mine* is translated by 'you appear,' as though it were the same as *faire mine de*. It means here more directly 'You make a face as though.'—64, 206. *Mais il met peu de poids* does not mean 'he has little power to,' but 'he lays little stress on.'—65, 213. *les visions du leur* is rendered by *leurs visions*, but *leur* refers to *esprit*.—73, 347. *Nous donnions chez les dames*, already discussed above, is here translated by 'we cut quite a figure,' which is not implied in these words.—82, 455. *Oh, oh, peste la belle!* The editor translates *la belle!* by 'you're a pretty creature!' This puts rather much stress on this vocative, while the whole stress should lie on *peste!* and *la belle* should be merely rendered by *my girl!*—105, 798. *Hai, hai* is hardly an interjection of astonishment, but expresses, with a smirk, assumed, but flattered, self-deprecation on the part of Trisotin, who is too convinced of his superiority to be astonished at praise.—110, 837. *celui-là* cannot be called a neuter pronoun; it is distinctly masculine and refers to something understood, *trait d'esprit, calembour*, etc.—124, 1061. *Ce n'est pas mon conte* (mod. *cela ne fait pas mon compte*) means 'that does not suit me,' or 'give me satisfaction,' and not 'I do not intend to,' or 'I cannot.'—144, 1432. *C'est par l'honneur qu'il a de rimer à latin*. Mr. Effinger thinks that *rimer à latin* means rime "with the grace of a Latin scholar." I can see no basis for that translation and I prefer Mr. Brush's literal rendering, 'rime with the word *Latin*.' Mr. Eggert does not remark upon this, so I take it that he also understands it in the latter manner.—151, 1553. *à vous si singulière* is translated by 'which is quite unusual.' I think that Mr. Brush's interpretation 'so peculiar to you,' 'so uniquely your own' is more exactly equivalent to the original.

No French writers are more commonly quoted than Lafontaine and Molière. It would therefore seem highly desirable to call the attention of the students to some lines that have almost become household words with the French and of which *Les Femmes Savantes* furnishes

a large share. I indicate by numbers and at random, after the Ef. and B. editions, some of the commonest ones: ll. 73-74; 419; 465; 477; 531; 543; 598; 1063; 1284; 1296; 1304; 1320; 1396; 1480; 1520; 1544; 1644; 1645-46; 1665; 1749; 1775-76; and l. 217, very appropriate these days.¹

J. L. BORGERHOFF.

Western Reserve University.

The Rise of the Novel of Manners: A Study of English Prose Fiction between 1600 and 1740. By CHARLOTTE E. MORGAN. New York, The Columbia University Press, 1911. ix + 271 pp.

Perhaps the greatest achievement of Miss Morgan's dissertation is its fresh indication of the immense possibilities of detailed research in the comparatively unworked field she has selected. Indeed, in the very state of affairs she has helped to reveal lies the source of her most notable difficulty, that of giving a comprehensive, well-ordered interpretation of what is still so much involved. Even those of us who feel the time ripe for the interpretative monograph of considerable scope are likely to experience a new thrill at the temerity of this undertaking. Still, paths must be broken, and Miss Morgan displays commendable modesty in presenting herself as a pioneer. Her book, she confesses at the outset, "is but a clearing of the ground in a field where little has been done and much remains to be accomplished." She stresses rather the significance of her valuable and extensive Bibliography of English fiction prior to 1740, although this too makes no claim to completeness. She is over-precise in acknowledging indebtedness to such previous

¹The following misprints have been noted. Eggert: p. 74, n. 4 should be numbered 5; p. 110, n. 18, *bleu* read *bleus*. Brush: period after l. 246; the suspension points after l. 275 are superfluous. Effinger: p. 104, l. 777, read *donnez-nous*; p. 110, l. 840, read *j'eus* for *j'ai* (although there is authority for both); p. 178, note on next to last line should refer to l. 957; p. 220, note to 1187, read *interrogation*.

studies as were available to her, as she has perhaps been over-inclined to depend upon them. On the whole, recognizing as she does the hazards and limitations of her task, she has as nearly overcome these as might reasonably be expected.

The fact remains, however, that this is an undertaking for the more mature scholar, with a broader sense of background. Without disparagement to the work before us, certain points may be noted where, for lack of this background, close and significant relationships have been passed over. Partly as a result of the general plan of treatment, the consideration of the novella-type in its relation to romance and later novel seems broken and inadequate, despite the natural presumption of its large influence. By ignoring the continental history of these stories, the actual points of contact with the other forms are not made apparent at all. In her references to the "voyage imaginaire" as a development of the "ideal commonwealth" (pp. 19 ff.), Miss Morgan fails to give due credit to long and respected—if not respectable—ancestry, omitting all mention of Lucian and Rabelais, and apparently not taking into account the immense vogue of their satire and its imitations in this period. Lucian is again ignored in the mention of Quevedo's *Visions* and related literature (p. 48), and is named but once in the entire book—in connection with Tom Brown's *Dialogues* and their kindred. The *Gargantua* of Rabelais appears in a list of French anti-romances (p. 44), apparently intended to represent the influence of *Don Quixote*. The ideals of the heroic romance (pp. 29 ff.), its critical treatment as poetry, and its close relation to drama and epic can be made clear only against the general "heroic" background which dominated French criticism in the seventeenth century and set scholars to penning elaborate compositions according to the code. Without depreciating the distinct vogue of the *Portuguese Letters* and the French revival of the *Letters of Abelard and Heloise* (pp. 70 ff.), it may be questioned if full value is put upon the development of the familiar letter in romances, secret histories, and the like, with its repeated emphasis on psy-

chological analysis as well as refined style. One feels, too, that there is more to be learned from the history of the contemporary drama and its sentimental tendencies, and from the various phases of feminism and the coterie life in France and England, than is indicated in the occasional notice taken of such matters.

Beyond question this investigation is a problem in comparative literature, France in particular affording so many models and instituting so many developments that it must be constantly taken into account. Yet Miss Morgan is regrettably cautious in confining her attention to English manifestations of these activities, even at the expense of unity and clearness throughout. "With the actual content of the romances," she says in one place, "—the pseudo-history, the episodes, the actual personages concealed under the assumed names—we are not concerned, since we are regarding them solely with respect to the English development" (p. 29). Having offered ample evidence that all romances of importance were well known in England, she is hardly justified in such unconcern. The current investigation of character-portraiture is throwing much light on the beginnings of English fiction, and there is reason to ascribe equal significance to other conventional elements in these romances. At almost every turn, indeed, there is a possibility of foreign parallels, but a single illustration will serve. On pages 63-65, three English stories of the last decade of the seventeenth century are outlined as typical of "the transition from the romance to the idealistic novel of manners." In a note (p. 65) the author thinks it worth while to suggest the close resemblance and perhaps indebtedness of these novels to a group of three French stories written by different authors as early as 1601-5, and never translated into English. Much closer and more attractive is the parallel to various of the moralized stories of Jean-Pierre Camus, just as clearly combining "romantic Spanish intrigue with prosaic contemporary manners" and consciously directing our sympathy toward the victims. The voluminous writings of this worthy bishop extended over more than thirty years—from 1610 to 1644—and attracted no

little immediate attention in France.¹ Their popularity in England is indicated by the following translations in a period when French originals were being widely read:—

- 1632–3. A Draught of Eternity: The Spiritual Director disinterested.
- 1639. Admirable Events: Selected out of Four Books.
- 1650. The Loving Enemie, or a Famous True History (Another edition in 1667).
- 1652. Nature's Paradox, or the Innocent Impostor.²
- 1677. Alcimus and Vannoza (Reprinted as Forced Marriage, 1678).

The particular novels Miss Morgan is discussing may have been independent of this influence, but with the example of Camus before them, English writers should not have found it difficult at any time to make the transition indicated.

The material of this study appears to fall readily into types and categories, such as the "seven well-defined types of romance" which determine the arrangement of Chapter I. In actual practice, however, the literary output of that day was little better adapted to such clear-cut distinctions than was Elizabethan literature, and the student is under no obligation to sustain them at all costs. One feels constantly that if Miss Morgan were not quite so conscientious in this regard, and managed her material with a somewhat freer hand, she would reach results more tangible and more approximately accurate. Concrete examples may be found in the treatment of the "ideal commonwealth" already cited, and in the attempt to keep the seven varieties of romance distinct in character and influence throughout their history. Even the formal and rather forced distinction of romance and novel, which

helps to shift the Duchess of Newcastle into the period after 1700 in the book, would seem to complicate the general problem unnecessarily.

In so comprehensive a study, the type method of treatment is attractive, partly because it offers opportunity to clear the field by setting certain categories aside as "negligible." Yet the nature of this field is such that practically nothing may be neglected. The first negligible quantity set aside by Miss Morgan—the material of popular fiction—is later assigned some significance, and is given a consideration that is highly suggestive of large possibilities (pp. 115 ff.). Sidney's *Arcadia* is similarly dismissed, notwithstanding the admission that references to it in the seventeenth century were legion, and that it may have given name to Richardson's first heroine (p. 15). Translations of foreign literature usually have their influence depreciated unless specific English imitations appear. This is in part the reason for the slight and disconnected treatment given to the Protean forms of the *roman à clef* and the closely-allied romantic autobiographies of the period. These free-lances of literature, in their varying moods, served too large a purpose in bringing the romance down to everyday existence, to receive mere passing mention. Indeed, one would not go far astray in undertaking to find in them a unifying principle for the entire shaping of the problem. By the beginning of the seventeenth century, Italy and France were familiar enough with romances suspected of disguising actual personages and experiences; with memoirs that improvised at times in romantic directions; with the "secret history" concerned largely with apocryphal and highly scandalous amours. D'Urfé's *Astrée* and the *Hôtel de Rambouillet*, appearing simultaneously in France, gave marked impetus to the custom of fusing fiction and reality. A rapid growth of burlesque and realistic romance gave material encouragement to the natural tendency toward a lower social scale and certain picturesque details, of which the novella-tradition provided an abundant supply. By 1660, when Bussy-Rabutin composed his *Histoire amoureuse des Gaules*, it must have

¹ A bibliography of Camus's works is given by Koerting, *Geschichte des Französischen Romans im XVII Jahrhundert*, ed. 1891, pp. 208-210, following a critical chapter, with outlines of certain of the stories.

² This story, published by Camus in 1625 with the title *Iphigène*, seems to be the source of Suckling's *Tragedy of Brennoralt*, produced about 1640.

mattered little to a French reader whether he found his lighter entertainment classified as *histoire*, *amours*, *mémoires*, *roman*, or *roman satirique*; whether the scene was laid in remote regions, or ancient monarchies, or some no-man's-land of the imagination. The personages were likely to be of his own time and country, the matter built on the half-truth of current scandal, and the tone strongly satirical. The method was in great part a colloquial adaptation of that in the heroic romances, retaining the conventions of elaborate episodes, character-portraits, and inserted correspondence.³

Literature of this sort was soon popular in England as well as in France, appealing both to the nobler-minded, who read it as social satire, and to the baser sort, who frankly enjoyed its indecency. The fact that the first original English contribution was *Queen Zarah and the Zarazians*, in 1705 (p. 85), loses significance as one begins to realize the amount of such material translated from the French before that date. *Zarah* itself was represented as rendered through the French from an Italian original.⁴ Miss Morgan's own bibliography indicates the prevalence of such fiction in the early eighteenth century, and makes evident the arbitrary way in which English authors threw similar material under various categories: memoirs, histories, amours, and novels. One recalls, in this connection, that many readers censured Richardson's *Pamela* for its indecency, and as many more busied themselves trying to identify the characters. Even if this movement in fiction does not appear to focus so directly on the work of Richardson, it cannot be swept aside in developing in its narrow sense what Miss Morgan interprets very loosely—"the novel of manners."

³ Cf. Bussy-Rabutin's own statement of his method and ideals, in the "lettre apologétique" to the *Histoire amoureuse*, ed. Garnier Frères, Paris, n. d., p. 2.

⁴ Steele in *Tatler* No. 84 (1709), after ridiculing the untruthfulness of current French memoirs, declares: "I do hereby give notice to all book-sellers and translators whatsoever, that the word Memoir is French for a novel."

In a dissertation with so wide a scope, it is no surprise, and no particular reason for censure, to discover a number of inaccuracies in incidental details. On reading the statement that in the seventeenth century, "the only fresh endeavor to deal, in narrative form, with the Arthurian material is to be found in the little known epics of Sir Richard Blackmore," one misses the familiar references to Milton's projects in this direction. It seems equally strange to find *Daphnis and Chloe* pronounced "quite free" from the absurd adventures and marvels of other Greek romances (p. 11). "In 1611," says Miss Morgan, "we find DuBartas referring to Sidney" (p. 15). Here, as her note indicates, she has not gone back of a reference in Jusserand's *English Novel in the Time of Shakspeare*, and has ignored the fact that the *Second Day of the Second Week*, in which this tribute appears, was published in 1584, and that DuBartas died in 1590. A similar oversight occurs later (p. 36) where Roger Boyle's *Parthenissa*, published in 1654, is represented as undoubtedly under the influence of Mrs. Katherine Philips. Boyle cannot be discovered in the pre-Restoration circle of "The Matchless Orinda," their friendship belonging to the period of her sojourn in Ireland, during 1662-3.

Miss Morgan's character-portrait of the Duchess of Newcastle (p. 91) contains several statements that cannot well be squared with the few facts available. Constant defiance of convention and Mrs. Grundy is not borne out by her pre-nuptial letters to the Duke in the Welbeck MSS.,⁵ expressing fear of the gossip at St. Germain. "I do not send to you to-day," she says in one of these, "for if I do, they will say I pursue you for your affections, for though I love you extremely I never feared my modesty so small as it would give me leave to court any man." That the Duchess was not given to sentimentalizing and to self-analysis must be mere matter of personal opinion, in which not all readers of her autobiography and prefaces will share. Indeed, the comment

⁵ Cf. *The First Duke and Duchess of Newcastle-upon-Tyne*. New York, 1910, pp. 180-186.

seems hardly consistent with Miss Morgan's final estimate, that the Duchess, in a lifetime of restless seeking for better self-expression, never managed to speak out to her satisfaction. If she did not so manage, the prodigious extent of her printed works, her own description of the pen speeding to keep pace with her nimble fancies,⁶ and Theophilus Cibber's account of her overworked group of trained secretaries⁷ leave us wondering what could have been left unsaid.

By some inadvertency, at the beginning of Chapter IV only four of the five groups into which chap-book literature is to be divided get into Miss Morgan's enumeration at all. After some confusion the reader finds the missing category—moral and religious tracts—discussed in its proper order in the comment on these groups (p. 118). On page 59, Vital D'Audiguier appears as "D'Audiger"; and on page 121, George Lillo's significant tragedy is mentioned as "*George Barnfield*."

After all, as the author recognizes, this entire essay is only an interpretative introduction to the bibliographical material which is the kernel of the dissertation. Here there is a contribution that later students may enlarge and modify, but cannot fail to utilize. This particular period, most of it between the *Stationers' Register* and the institution of the monthly magazines, with their lists of current publications, has been sadly in need of just such systematic attention for all phases of literary production. With the material once before us, we may agree or not with details of Miss Morgan's analytical account of it; the thing of first importance is our possession of it in so convenient a form. The interpretation, it should be added, is probably as satisfying as could be made at the present time.

A. H. UPHAM.

Bryn Mawr College.

Pierre de Ronsard, Essai de biographie: les ancêtres—la jeunesse; par HENRI LONGNON. Paris: Champion, 1912. xii, 512 pp. (Bibl. litt. de la Renaissance, xi.)

Pierre de Ronsard occupies a curious position in the history of French letters in that until the last few years almost no study at all has been made of his life, and that even now a comprehensive, scientific biography remains to be written. When the first posthumous edition of Ronsard's poetry appeared in 1586, Claude Binet, one of the two editors, added a 'life' which he had prepared for the poet's obsequies, and which gave in sympathetic manner the essential facts and details of the author's ancestry, personality, and manner of living. This life was interesting, and, though full of errors, has been the basis of all subsequent studies of the subject, of which the most recent are nothing more than editions of Binet's text with notes and corrections by Miss Helen Evers¹ and by Mr. Paul Laumonier.² The field was thus open for Mr. Longnon to present an independent biography, and, so far as he has gone, he has done this in a most satisfactory manner. Unfortunately, as the work is but an outgrowth of his thesis at the Ecole des Chartes, his study only embraces the ancestry and youth of the poet.

Mr. Longnon uses as his chief sources the biography of Binet and Ronsard's own statements in his poetry. These sources he controls by a mass of contemporary evidence, largely drawn from ancient documents, which he cites in detail in his appendices. It is to be regretted that he has failed to add an index and a list of the works consulted. The references in the footnotes are numerous and absolutely clear, but it is necessary to turn to Mr. Laumonier's excellent lists for any extensive bibliography.³

¹ *Critical Edition of the Discours de la vie de Pierre de Ronsard*, Bryn Mawr dissertation, Philadelphia, 1905.

² *Vie de Ronsard de Claude Binet*, Paris, 1910.

³ Cf. Laumonier, *op. cit.* and *Ronsard, poète lyrique*, Paris, 1909. Neither writer mentions the recent

⁶ Cf. *The Life of William Cavendish*, ed. C. H. Firth. London, 1886, p. 307.

⁷ *Lives of the Poets of Great Britain and Ireland*. London, 1753, II, 164.